

Remarks:

Reconsideration of the application is requested. Claims 1-14 are now in the application. Claims 1-12 have been amended. Claims 13 and 14 have been added.

Support for new claims 13 and 14 can be found in original claims 1 and 4.

35 USC §103(a):

In item 1 of the Office action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-9 as being unpatentable over Gosis et al. (US Pat No. 6,712,292) in view of Schmon et al. (US Patent No. 6,877,677) under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Schmon et al. '677 is not prior art. Schmon et al. '677 has identical inventors as the instant application. Accordingly, Schmon '677 is not a patent or publication by "another". Therefore, Schmon et al. '677 is not available under 35 USC §102(e). Applicants further note that 35 USC §102(b) does not apply because the Schmon et al. '677 neither published nor issued more than one year earlier than the priority of the instant application (i.e. January 22, 2004); *see* 35 USC §102(b). The Section-119 priority document (DE 10 2004 004 438.9) is part of the record of the international record (WO 2005/070558). Lastly, Schmon et al. '677 is not available as prior art because the instant application and Schmon et al '677 are both assigned to the same assignee (i.e. Sata Farbspritztechnik GmbH & Co. KG); *see* 35 USC §103(c). The assignment of both the instant application and Schmon et al. '677 is recorded at reel/frame 019181/0772.

New claims 13 and 14 are further offered to distinguish the "prior" art. New claims 13 and 14 are based on claims 1 and 4 of the preliminary amendment. The invention according to claims 13 and 14 would not be obvious in light of Gosis et al. '292 in view of Schmon et al. '677 for the following reason. Claim 13 calls for a flow reservoir for a spray gun, with the following features:

a lid being configured to fit on a bowl-shaped container;

an attachment part (3) being configured to connect to the spray gun, said attachment part (3) including a tubular connector (5) with a screw-wedge element (8) for direct and rapid connection to the spray gun, said tubular connector (5) being formed directly on said lid (2) and including a contact surface (15) to limit a depth to which said tubular connector (5) is screwable when said screw-wedge element (8) is used for fastening to the spray gun.

Gosis et al. '292 teaches a flow reservoir for a paint spray gun with a bowl shaped container 12, a cover 58 that can be set on the container and an attachment part 70 for fastening the container onto the paint spray gun. However, the attachment part of Goss et al. '292 is not formed by a connector directly on the cover with a screw wedge element for direct quick connect attachment of the flow reservoir. The connector part of Gosis et al. is a separate part formed as an adaptor to allow applicator arm 20 and container arm 22 to be rotated into different orientations with respect to each other. However, Gosis et al. '292 does not suggest a screw-wedge element for direct quick-connect attachment of the flow reservoir to the paint spray gun. Gosis et al. '292 also does not show or suggest a lateral stop face to limit the dept to which the tubular connector is screwed in when the screw-wedge element is used for fastening the flow reservoir.

Schmon et al. '677 suggests a flow reservoir for a paint spray gun with a cup-shaped container 5, a lid 7 that can be fitted on the container 5 and a connecting stub 12 with a threaded wedge element 14 for direct rapid connection of the gravity cup to the paint spray gun. The connecting stud 12, however, is not formed directly to the lid but to the bottom 9 of the cup-shaped container. Schmon et al. '677 also does not provide any suggestion of a lateral stop face on the connecting stub in order to delimit the screw-in depth when the threaded wedge element is used for fastening the flow reservoir. In contrast to the Examiner's analysis, Figure 2b of Schmon et al. '677 does not show any lateral stop face in order to delimit the screw-in depth for the threaded wedge element.

In item 8 of the Office action, the Examiner rejected claims 10-12 as being unpatentable over Gosis et al. in view of Schmon et al. and WO 2004/037433 under 35 USC §103(a). As discussed previously, Schmon et al. is not available as prior art. The remaining reference fail to form a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

Appl. No. 10/597,159  
Amendment Dated September 17, 2009  
Reply to Office Action of April 17, 2009

Other cited "Prior" art:

The Examiner cited Hsiang 7,036,752 as prior art. Considering the instant application's priority date, Hsian 7,036,752 is not prior art.

Conclusion:

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-14 are solicited. In the event the Examiner should still find any of the claims to be unpatentable, please telephone counsel so that patentable language can be substituted.

Petition for extension is herewith made. The extension fee for response within a period of two months pursuant to Section 1.136(a) in the amount of \$245 in accordance with Section 1.17 is enclosed herewith.

If any further extension of time for this paper is required, petition for extension is herewith made.

No additional fee is believed due. However, please charge any required fee (or credit any overpayments of fees) to the Deposit Account of the undersigned, Account No. 500601 (Docket No. 7400-X06-152)

Respectfully submitted,

/Loren D. Pearson/

Loren Donald Pearson, Reg. No. 42,987  
Martin Fleit, Reg. No. 16,900

Customer Number: 27317

FLEIT GIBBONS GUTMAN BONGINI & BIANCO, P.L.  
21355 East Dixie Highway  
Suite 115  
Miami, FL 33180  
Tel: 305-830-2600  
Fax: 305-830-2605  
e-mail: LPearson@FGGBB.com